Baryon asymmetry via leptogenesis in a neutrino mass model with complex scaling

Rome Samanta[a*], Mainak Chakraborty[b†], Probir Roy[c‡], Ambar Ghosal[a§]
a) Saha Institute of Nuclear Physics, HBNI, 1/AF Bidhannagar, Kolkata 700064, India
b) Centre of Excellence in Theoretical and Mathematical Sciences,
SOA University, Khandagiri Square, Bhubaneswar 751030, India
c) Center for Astroparticle Physics and Space Science, Bose Institute, Kolkata 700091, India

November 1, 2016

arXiv:1610.10081v1 [hep-ph] 31 Oct 2016

Abstract

Baryogenesis via leptogenesis is investigated in a specific model of light neutrino masses and mixing angles. The latter was proposed on the basis of an assumed complex-extended scaling property of the neutrino Majorana mass matrix M_ν, derived with a type-1 seesaw from a Dirac mass matrix m_D and a heavy singlet neutrino Majorana mass matrix M_R. One of its important features, highlighted here, is that *there is a common source of the origin of a nonzero θ_{13} and the CP violating lepton asymmetry through the imaginary part of m_D.* The model predicted CP violation to be maximal for the Dirac type and vanishing for the Majorana type. We assume strongly hierarchical mass eigenvalues for M_R. The leptonic CP asymmetry parameter ε_1^α with lepton flavor α, originating from the decays of the lightest of the heavy neutrinos N_1 (of mass M_1) at a temperature $T \sim M_1$, is what matters here with $\varepsilon_{2,3}^\alpha$, originating from the decays of $N_{2,3}$, being washed out. The light leptonic and heavy neutrino number densities (normalized to the entropy density) are evolved via Boltzmann equations down to electroweak temperatures to yield a baryon asymmetry through sphaleronic transitions. The effect of flavored vs. unflavored leptogenesis in the three mass regimes (1) $M_1 < 10^9$ GeV, (2) 10^9 GeV $< M_1 < 10^{12}$ GeV and (3) $M_1 > 10^{12}$ GeV are numerically worked out for both a normal and an inverted mass ordering of the light neutrinos. Corresponding results on the baryon asymmetry of the universe are obtained, displayed and discussed. For best-fit values of the input neutrino mass and mixing parameters, obtained from neutrino oscillation experiments, successful baryogenesis is achieved for the mass regime (1) and a normal mass ordering of the light neutrinos with a nonzero θ_{13} playing a crucial role. However, the other possibilities in regard to the mass regimes and the light neutrino mass ordering, though disfavored, cannot be excluded.

*rome.samanta@saha.ac.in
†mainak.chakraborty2@gmail.com
‡probirrana@gmail.com
§ambar.ghosal@saha.ac.in

1 Introduction

Much effort has already been made towards understanding the origin of the baryon asymmetry of the universe $Y_B = (n_B - n_{\bar{B}})/s \simeq (8.7 \pm 0.1) \times 10^{-11}$ [1] – the number density (n_B) of baryons minus that ($n_{\bar{B}}$) of antibaryons normalized to the entropy density s. A comprehensive review with references may be found in Ref. [2]. Various possible mechanisms have been considered for this purpose, e.g. GUT baryogenesis, electroweak baryogenesis, the Affleck-Dine mechanism and baryogenesis via leptogenesis. We concentrate on the last-mentioned possibility [3–8]. Here a CP odd particle-antiparticle asymmetry is first generated at a high scale in the leptonic sector; that is thereafter converted into a baryon asymmetry by sphaleron processes during the electroweak phase transition. In the most popular extension of the Standard Model (SM) for generating light neutrino masses, three[1] heavy right-chiral (RH) singlet neutrinos are added to induce tiny neutrino masses and their mixing angles through the type-1 seesaw mechanism [9–12]. The complex Yukawa couplings $f^N_{i\alpha}$, that connect those singlet RH neutrinos N_i to the SM-doublet left-chiral leptons of flavor α, generate the necessary CP violation in the decays of those heavy RH neutrinos into the Higgs scaler plus the SM leptons. The occurrence of Majorana mass terms for the heavy neutrinos in the Lagrangian provides the required lepton nonconservation. The rate of interaction with those Yukawa couplings being smaller than the Hubble expansion rate, departure from thermal equilibrium ensues. Hence all the Sakarav conditions [13] are fulfilled for generating Y_B. The present work is devoted to the study of the origin of Y_B via leptogenesis in a model [14, 15] of neutrino masses with complex scaling – proposed by some of us. As a step towards that, we shall summarize in the next Sec. 2 the relevant features of the concerned model.

First, let us establish our notation and convention by choosing without loss of generality the Weak Basis (sometimes called the leptogenesis basis [16]) in which the 3×3 mass matrices, not only of the charged leptons but also of the heavy RH neutrinos, are diagonal with nondegenerate real and positive entries, e.g. $M_R = \text{diag}\,(M_1, M_2, M_3)$, $M_i\ (i = 1, 2, 3) > 0$. We shall work in the strongly hierarchical scenario in the right-chiral neutrino sector in which those masses will be taken to be widely spaced. Specifically, we assume that $M_1 << M_2 << M_3$. A crucial input into these scenarios is the flavor structure of the neutrino Dirac mass matrix m_D. The latter appears in the neutrino mass terms of the Lagrangian as

$$-\mathcal{L}^{\nu,N}_{mass} = \frac{1}{2}\bar{N}_{iR}(m_D)_{i\alpha}\nu_{L\alpha} + \frac{1}{2}\bar{N}_{iR}(M_R)_i\delta_{ij}N^C_{jR} + \text{h.c.} \tag{1.1}$$

with $N^C_j = C\bar{N}^T_j$. The effective light neutrino Majorana mass matrix M_ν is then given by the standard seesaw result [9–12]

$$M_\nu = -m_D^T M_R^{-1} m_D. \tag{1.2}$$

This M_ν enters the effective low energy neutrino mass term in the Lagrangian as

$$-\mathcal{L}^{\nu}_{mass} = \frac{1}{2}\bar{\nu^C_{L\alpha}}(M_\nu)_{\alpha\beta}\nu_{L\beta} + \text{h.c.} \tag{1.3}$$

It is a complex symmetric 3×3 matrix ($M^*_\nu \neq M_\nu = M^T_\nu$) which can be put into a diagonal form by a similarity transformation with a unitary matrix U:

$$U^T M_\nu U = M^d_\nu \equiv \text{diag}\,(\text{m}_1, \text{m}_2, \text{m}_3) \tag{1.4}$$

with $\text{m}_i\ (i = 1, 2, 3)$ taken to be nonzero, real and small positive masses $< \mathcal{O}(\text{eV})$. In our Weak Basis we can take U as

$$U = U_{PMNS} \equiv \begin{pmatrix} c_{12}c_{13} & e^{i\frac{\alpha}{2}}s_{12}c_{13} & s_{13}e^{-i(\delta-\frac{\beta}{2})} \\ -s_{12}c_{23} - c_{12}s_{23}s_{13}e^{i\delta} & e^{i\frac{\alpha}{2}}(c_{12}c_{23} - s_{12}s_{13}s_{23}e^{i\delta}) & c_{13}s_{23}e^{i\frac{\beta}{2}} \\ s_{12}s_{23} - c_{12}s_{13}c_{23}e^{i\delta} & e^{i\frac{\alpha}{2}}(-c_{12}s_{23} - s_{12}s_{13}c_{23}e^{i\delta}) & c_{13}c_{23}e^{i\frac{\beta}{2}} \end{pmatrix} \tag{1.5}$$

with $c_{ij} \equiv \cos\theta_{ij}$, $s_{ij} \equiv \sin\theta_{ij}$ and $\theta_{ij} = [0, \pi/2]$. CP violation enters here through nonzero values of the Dirac phase δ and of the Majorana phases α, β with $\delta, \alpha, \beta = [0, 2\pi]$. We follow the PDG convention [17] on these angles and phases except that we denote the Majorana phases by α and β.

In the main body of the paper we calculate the CP asymmetry originating from the decays $N_i \to \not{L}_\alpha\phi$, $\not{L}^C_\alpha\phi^\dagger$ where $\not{L}_\alpha$ and ϕ are the respective fields of the SM left-chiral lepton doublet of flavor α and the Higgs doublet. This is done in terms of the imaginary parts of the appropriately defined quartic products of the neutrino Dirac mass matrix m_D and its hermitian conjugate $m^\dagger_D$, as well as on an explicit function of the variable $x_{ij} \equiv M^2_j/M^2_i$. Clearly, the calculation depends sensitively on the flavor structure of m_D and hence on the specific neutrino mass model under consideration. The CP asymmetries (and hence

[1] This can be done with two heavy RH singlet neutrinos but not with just one.

leptogenesis as a whole) may be flavor dependent or independent according to the temperature regime in which the CP violating decays take place. For an evolution down to the electroweak scale, one needs to solve the corresponding Boltzmann Equations. We therefore consider the Boltzmann evolution equation for the number density n_a of a particle of type a (either a right-chiral heavy neutrino N_i or a left-chiral lepton doublet $\not{L}_\alpha$) normalized to the photon number density n_γ. For this purpose, we take

$$\eta_a(z) = \frac{n_a(z)}{n_\gamma(z)}, n_\gamma(z) = \frac{2M_1^3}{\pi^2 z^3} \tag{1.6}$$

as a function of $z \equiv M_1/T$. We rewrite these equations for the variable Y_a where

$$Y_a = n_a/s = \frac{n_\gamma}{s}\eta_a = 1.8 g_{*s}\eta_a, \tag{1.7}$$

g_{*s} being the total number of effective and independent massless degrees of freedom at that temperature. The evolution of Y_a is studied for different a's from a temperature of the order of the lightest right-chiral neutrino mass M_1 to that of the electroweak phase transition where sphaleron-induced processes take place converting the lepton asymmetry into a baryon asymmetry Y_B.

In pursuing Y_B, we need to zero in on Y_{Δ_λ} where $\Delta_\lambda = \frac{1}{3}B - L_\lambda$ with B being the baryon number and L_λ the lepton number of the active flavor λ. The analysis is done numerically but in three different regimes [7,8] depending on where M_1 lies: (1) $M_1 < 10^9$ GeV where all the lepton flavor are individually active, (2) 10^9 GeV $< M_1 < 10^{12}$ GeV where e and μ flavors are indistinguishable but the τ-flavor is separately active and (3) 10^{12} GeV $< M_1$ where all lepton flavors are indistinguishable. The quantity Y_B and Y_{Δ_λ} are linearly related but with different numerical coefficients for the three different regimes. In our numerical analysis, six constraints from experimental and observational data are inputted: the 3σ ranges of the solar and atmospheric neutrino mass squared differences as well as of the three neutrino mixing angles plus the cosmological upper bound on the sum of the three light neutrino masses. The analysis is done separately in each regime for a normal mass ordering ($m_3 > m_2 > m_1$) as well as for an inverted ordering ($m_2 > m_1 > m_3$) of the light neutrinos. The final results are tabulated numerically as well as displayed graphically.

We have already mentioned the content of Section 2. The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 3 we calculate the CP asymmetry parameters generated in the decays of N_i into $\not{L}_\alpha\phi$ and $\not{L}^C_\alpha\phi^\dagger$. Section 4 contains an algebraic treatment of the Boltzmann evolution equations and the generation of the baryon asymmetry Y_B in the three mass regimes. The numerical analysis that follows is detailed with a discussion of its consequences in Section 5. A summary of our work is given in the last Section 6.

2 Complex scaling with type-I seesaw

A key feature of M_ν is the $\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2$ residual symmetry [18] that it possesses. This is an invariance of M_ν under a linear transformation on neutrino fields

$$\nu_{L\alpha} \to G_{\alpha\beta}\nu_{L\beta}, \tag{2.1}$$

i.e. in matrix notation,

$$G^T M_\nu G = M_\nu. \tag{2.2}$$

One can show [18] that there are two independent matrices $G^{2,3}$ implementing this invariance and obeying

$$G^{2,3}U = U d^{2,3}, \tag{2.3}$$

where $d^2 = $ diag. $(-1, 1-, 1)$ and $d^3 = $ diag. $(-1, -1, 1)$. Some of us have proposed [14] a complex extension of this symmetry by considering the nonstandard CP transformations

$$\nu_{L\alpha} \to i(G_L)_{\alpha\beta}\gamma^0\nu^C_{L\beta}, \qquad N_{Ri} \to i(G_R)_{ij}\gamma^0 N^C_{Rj} \tag{2.4}$$

and demanding the invariance relations

$$G_R^\dagger m_D G_L = m_D^*, \quad G_R^\dagger M_R G_R^* = M_R^*. \tag{2.5}$$

Eqs. (1.2) and (2.5) together imply

$$G_L^T M_\nu G_L = M_\nu^* \tag{2.6}$$

which is our complex-extended invariance statement on low energy neutrino Majorana mass matrix M_ν. At this point, G_L was taken to be [14]

$$G_L = G_3^{\rm scaling} = \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & (1-k^2)(1+k^2)^{-1} & 2k(1+k^2)^{-1} \\ 0 & 2k(1+k^2)^{-1} & -(1-k^2)(1+k^2)^{-1} \end{pmatrix} = (G_3^{scaling})^T, \tag{2.7}$$

k being a real scaling factor. This $G_3^{\rm scaling}$ is the operative residual symmetry generator for the original scaling ansatz [19–22]. It now obeys the relation

$$G_3^{\rm scaling} U^* = U\tilde{d}, \tag{2.8}$$

where $\tilde{d}_{\alpha\beta} = \pm\delta_{\alpha\beta}$ and hence admits eight possibilities. Only four of these were shown to be viable and led independently to the results

$$\tan\theta_{23} = k^{-1}, \tag{2.9}$$

$$\sin\alpha = \sin\beta = \cos\delta = 0. \tag{2.10}$$

The detailed phenomenological consequences of (2.9) and (2.10) were worked out in Ref. [14]. The most general M_ν that satisfies

$$(G_3^{\rm scaling})^T M_\nu G_3^{\rm scaling} = M_\nu^*, \tag{2.11}$$

is given by the complex-extended scaling (CES) form of M_ν, namely [14]

$$M_\nu^{CES} = \begin{pmatrix} x & -y_1 k + iy_2 k^{-1} & y_1 + iy_2 \\ -y_1 k + iy_2 k^{-1} & z_1 - wk^{-1}(k^2-1) - iz_2 & w - iz_2(2k)^{-1}(k^2-1) \\ y_1 + iy_2 & w - iz_2(2k)^{-1}(k^2-1) & z_1 + iz_2 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{2.12}$$

where x, $y_{1,2}$, $z_{1,2}$ and w are real mass dimensional quantities.

Since M_R has been taken to be diagonal, the corresponding symmetry generator matrix G_R, cf. the second of Eqs. (2.5), is diagonal with entries ±1, i.e.

$$G_R = {\rm diag}\,(\pm1, \pm1, \pm1). \tag{2.13}$$

Thus there are eight different structures of G_R. Correspondingly, from the first relation of (2.5), there could be eight possible different structures of m_D. It can be shown by tedious algebra that all other structures of G_R, except for

$$G_R = {\rm diag}\,(-1, -1, -1), \tag{2.14}$$

are incompatible with scaling symmetry [19]. Thus we take G_R of (2.14) as the only viable residual symmetry of M_R. We can now write the first of (2.5) as

$$m_D G_L = -m_D^* \tag{2.15}$$

which is really a complex extension of the Joshipura-Rodejohann result[2] [23] $m_D G_L = -m_D$.

The most general m_D that satisfies (2.15) is

$$m_D^{CES} = \begin{pmatrix} a & b_1 + ib_2 & -b_1/k + ib_2 k \\ e & c_1 + ic_2 & -c_1/k + ic_2 k \\ f & d_1 + id_2 & -d_1/k + id_2 k \end{pmatrix}, \tag{2.16}$$

where a, $b_{1,2}$, $c_{1,2}$, $d_{1,2}$, e and f are nine a priori unknown real mass dimensional quantities apart from the real, positive, dimensionless k. Using (1.2), M_ν^{CES} of (2.12) obtains with the real mass parameters x, $y_{1,2}$, $z_{1,2}$ and w related to those of (2.16), as given in Table 1. It is noteworthy that whereas m_D^{CES} has ten real parameters, M_ν^{CES} has only seven.

Table 1: Parameters of M_ν^{CES} in terms of the parameters of m_D and M_R.

$$\begin{array}{c} x = -(\frac{a^2}{M_1} + \frac{e^2}{M_2} + \frac{f^2}{M_3}) \\ y_1 = \frac{1}{k}(\frac{ab_1}{M_1} + \frac{ec_1}{M_2} + \frac{fd_1}{M_3}) \\ y_2 = k(\frac{ab_2}{M_1} + \frac{ec_2}{M_2} + \frac{fd_2}{M_3}) \\ z_1 = -\frac{1}{k^2}(\frac{b_1^2}{M_1} + \frac{c_1^2}{M_2} + \frac{d_1^2}{M_3}) + k^2(\frac{b_2^2}{M_1} + \frac{c_2^2}{M_2} + \frac{d_2^2}{M_3}) \\ z_2 = \frac{2b_1b_2}{M_1} + \frac{2c_1c_2}{M_2} + \frac{2d_1d_2}{M_3} \\ w = \frac{1}{k}(\frac{b_1^2}{M_1} + \frac{c_1^2}{M_2} + \frac{d_1^2}{M_3}) + k(\frac{b_2^2}{M_1} + \frac{c_2^2}{M_2} + \frac{d_2^2}{M_3}) \end{array}$$

[2] Those authors followed a different phase convention; they obtained $m_D G_L = m_D$ instead of $m_D G_L = -m_D$.

One can count the real parameters, as given in m_D of (2.16). Along with the RH neutrino masses M_1, M_2, M_3, one obtains a set of thirteen real parameters for M_ν. In order to reduce the number of parameters towards attaining the goal of a tractable result, we first use the assumed hierarchical nature of the RH neutrino masses $M_1 << M_2 << M_3$. We then take the parameters $d_{1,2}$, e and f in Table 1 to be of the same order of magnitude as a, $b_{1,2}$ and $c_{1,2}$. That enables us to neglect all terms in Table 1 with M_3 in the denominator. Now we rescale the remaining parameters of Table 1 as follows:

$$a \longrightarrow a' = \frac{a}{\sqrt{M_1}}, \tag{2.17}$$

$$b_{1,2} \longrightarrow b'_{1,2} = \frac{b_{1,2}}{\sqrt{M_1}}, \tag{2.18}$$

$$c_{1,2} \longrightarrow c'_{1,2} = \frac{c_{1,2}}{\sqrt{M_2}}, \tag{2.19}$$

$$e \longrightarrow e' = \frac{e}{\sqrt{M_2}}. \tag{2.20}$$

Consequently, the entries of Table 1 can be written in terms of the rescaled parameters as in Table 2. We are now left with a six-dimensional parameter space with the real parameters x, $y_{1,2}$, $z_{1,2}$ and w as given in Table 2. Note that, had we neglected the terms with M_2 in the denominator too, we would have been left with a three dimensional parameter space which would have been in a danger of being overdetermined by the six experimental and observational constraints mentioned in the Introduction. We shall latter discuss how to estimate the missing parameters f and $d_{1,2}$.

Table 2: Parameters of m_D^{CES} in the rescaled version.

$x = -({a'}^2 + {e'}^2)$
$y_1 = \frac{1}{k}(a'b'_1 + e'c'_1)$
$y_2 = -k(a'b'_2 + e'c'_2)$
$z_1 = -\frac{1}{k^2}({b'_1}^2 + {c'_1}^2) + k^2({b'_2}^2 + {c'_2}^2)$
$z_2 = 2b'_1b'_2 + 2c'_1c'_2$
$w = \frac{1}{k}({b'_1}^2 + {c'_1}^2) + k({b'_2}^2 + {c'_2}^2)$

Before concluding this section, let us make an important point. In the absence of of any imaginary part of the matrix m_D^{CES} of (2.16), the seesaw relation (1.2) gives rise to the Generalized Real Scaling form of M_ν, namely [14]

$$M_\nu^{GRS} = \begin{pmatrix} x & -y_1k & y_1 \\ -y_1k & z_1 - wk^{-1}(k^2-1) & w \\ y_1 & w & z_1 \end{pmatrix} \tag{2.21}$$

with real mass-dimensional entries. However, as was explained in Ref. [14], in this case θ_{13} vanishes and so information about the Dirac CP violating phase δ is lost. Moreover, owing to the real nature of the associated m_D^{GRS}, there is no Majorana CP violation either. Thus we see that the imaginary part of m_D^{CES} is the common source of an operative nonzero θ_{13} as well as CP violation in leptonic sector. The latter is in fact crucial to leptogenesis which is effected through a nonzero value of the CP asymmetry parameter ϵ, as explained in the next section. It is through the nonvanishing nature of Im m_D^{CES} that the final matter-antimatter asymmetry in the universe is directly related to the low energy parameters θ_{13} and δ.

3 Calculation of CP asymmetry parameter

The part of our Lagrangian relevant to the generation of a CP asymmetry is

$$-\mathcal{L}_D = f^N_{i\alpha}\overline{N}_{Ri}\tilde{\phi}^\dagger \not{L}_\alpha + h.c., \tag{3.1}$$

where $\not{L}_\alpha = (\nu_{L_\alpha} \;\; \ell^-_{L\alpha})^T$ is the left-chiral SM lepton doublet of flavor α, while $\tilde{\phi} = (\phi^{0*} \;\; -\phi^-)^T$ is the charge conjugated Higgs scaler doublet. It is evident from (3.1) that the decay products of N_i can be $\ell^-_\alpha\phi^+, \nu_\alpha\phi^0, \ell^+_\alpha\phi^-, \nu^C_\alpha\phi^{0*}$. We are interested in the flavor dependent CP asymmetry parameter ε^α_i which is given by

$$\varepsilon^\alpha_i \;\; = \;\; \frac{\Gamma(N_i \to \not{L}_\alpha\phi) - \Gamma(N_i \to \not{L}^C_\alpha\phi^\dagger)}{\Gamma(N_i \to \not{L}_\alpha\phi) + \Gamma(N_i \to \not{L}^C_\alpha\phi^\dagger)}, \tag{3.2}$$



Figure 1: Tree level as well as one loop vertex correction and self energy diagrams that contribute to the CP asymmetry parameter ε_1^α. The flavor of the internal charged lepton ℓ_β is summed and the Yukawa coupling f^N is supplied with appropriate flavor indices in the interference amplitude.

Γ being the corresponding partial decay width. A nonzero value of ε_i^α needs to arise out of the interference between the tree level and one loop contributions [4]. This is since at the tree level we have

$$\Gamma^{tree}(N_i \to \not{L}_\alpha \phi) = \Gamma^{tree}(N_i \to \not{L}_\alpha^C \phi^\dagger) = (16\pi)^{-1}(f_{i\alpha}^{N\dagger} f_{i\alpha}^N) M_i, \text{ (no sum over i)}. \tag{3.3}$$

One loop contributions come both from vertex correction and self-energy terms (cf. Fig.1). For leptogenesis with hierarchical heavy RH neutrinos, (3.2) can be evaluated to be

$$\varepsilon_i^\alpha = \frac{1}{4\pi v^2 \mathcal{H}_{ii}} \sum_{j\neq i} g(x_{ij})\ \text{Im}\ \mathcal{H}_{ij}(m_D)_{i\alpha}(m_D^*)_{j\alpha} + \frac{1}{4\pi v^2 \mathcal{H}_{ii}} \sum_{j\neq i} \frac{\text{Im}\ \mathcal{H}_{ji}(m_D)_{i\alpha}(m_D{}^*)_{j\alpha}}{(1-x_{ij})}. \tag{3.4}$$

In (3.4) $< \phi^0 >= v/\sqrt{2}$ so that $m_D = v f^N/\sqrt{2}$, $\mathcal{H} \equiv m_D m_D{}^\dagger$ and x_{ij} was defined in Sec.1. Furthermore, $g(x_{ij})$ is given by

$$g(x_{ij}) \quad = \quad \frac{\sqrt{x_{ij}}}{1-x_{ij}} + f(x_{ij}), \tag{3.5}$$

where the first RHS term arises from the one loop self energy term interfering with the tree level contribution. The second RHS term, originating from the interference of the contribution from the one loop vertex correction diagram with the tree level term, is given by

$$f(x_{ij}) = \sqrt{x_{ij}} \left[1 - (1+x_{ij}) \ln\left(\frac{1+x_{ij}}{x_{ij}}\right)\right]. \tag{3.6}$$

Let us discuss some physics aspects of (3.4). As already mentioned, depending upon the temperature regime in which leptogenesis occurs, lepton flavors may be fully distinguishable, partly distinguishable or indistinguishable. It is reasonable to assume that leptogenesis takes place at $T \sim M_1$. It is known [4] that lepton flavors cannot be treated separately if the concerned process occurs above a temperature $T \sim M_1 > 10^{12}$ GeV. In case the said temperature is lower, two possibilities arise. When $T \sim M_1 < 10^9$ GeV all three (e, μ, τ) flavors are individually active and we need three CP asymmetry parameters $\varepsilon_i^e, \varepsilon_i^\mu, \varepsilon_i^\tau$ for each generation of RH neutrinos. On the other hand when we have 10^9 GeV $< T \sim M_1 < 10^{12}$ GeV, only the τ-flavor can be identified separately while the e and μ act indistinguishably. Here we need two CP asymmetry parameters $\varepsilon_i^{(2)} = \varepsilon_i^e + \varepsilon_i^\mu$ and ε_i^τ for each of the RH neutrinos. As an aside, let us point out a simplification in this model for unflavored leptogenesis which is relevant for the high temperature regime. Summing over all α,

$$\sum_\alpha \text{Im}\ \mathcal{H}_{ji}(m_D)_{i\alpha}(m_D{}^*)_{j\alpha} = \text{Im}\ H_{ji}\mathcal{H}_{ij} = \text{Im}\ H_{ji}\mathcal{H}_{ji}^* = \text{Im}\ |\mathcal{H}_{ji}|^2 = 0, \tag{3.7}$$

i.e. the second term in the RHS of (3.4) vanishes. The flavor-summed CP asymmetry parameter is therefore given by the simplified expression

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon_i \quad &= \quad \sum_\alpha \varepsilon_i^\alpha \\ &= \quad \frac{1}{4\pi v^2 \mathcal{H}_{ii}} \sum_{j\neq i} \left[f(x_{ij}) + \frac{\sqrt{x_{ij}}}{(1-x_{ij})}\right] \text{Im}\ \mathcal{H}_{ij}{}^2. \end{aligned} \tag{3.8}$$

In the mass model [14] being considered, it follows from (2.16) that

$$\mathcal{H}^{CES} = \begin{pmatrix} a^2 + b_1^2 p + b_2^2 q & ac + b_1 c_1 p + b_2 c_2 q & af + b_1 d_1 p + b_2 d_2 q \\ ac + b_1 c_1 p + b_2 c_2 q & e^2 + c_1^2 p + c_2^2 q & ef + c_1 d_1 p + c_2 d_2 q \\ af + b_1 d_1 p + b_2 d_2 q & ef + c_1 d_1 p + c_2 d_2 q & f^2 + d_1^2 p + d_2^2 q \end{pmatrix}, \tag{3.9}$$

with $p = 1 + k^{-2}$ and $q = 1 + k^2$. Since (3.9) implies Im $\mathcal{H}^{CES}$=0, it follows from (3.8) that

$$\varepsilon_i = 0, \tag{3.10}$$

i.e. flavored-summed leptogenesis does not take place for any N_i. With the assumption that only the decay of N_1 matters in generating the CP asymmetry, ε_1 is the pertinent quantity for unflavored leptogenesis, but it vanishes. This nonoccurrence of unflavored leptogenesis is one of the robust predictions of the model.

Next, we focus on the calculation of the α-flavored CP asymmetry in terms of x_{12}, x_{13} and the elements of m_D^{CES}. These are relevant for the fully flavored as well as the τ-flavored regimes. We find that

$$\varepsilon_1^e = 0, \tag{3.11}$$

while

$$\varepsilon_1^\mu = \xi[b_2 k^2(\chi_1 + \chi_2) + b_1(\chi_3 + \chi_4) - b_1^2\chi_5] = -\varepsilon_1^\tau. \tag{3.12}$$

In (3.12) the real parameters ξ and χ_i $(i = 1 - 5)$ are defined as

$$\begin{aligned}
\xi &= \frac{1}{4[b_1^2 + (a^2 + b_1^2 + b_2^2)k^2 + b_2^2 k^4]\pi v^2}, \\
\chi_1 &= b_2(1+k^2)[c_1 c_2\{1 + g(x_{12}) - x_{12}\} + d_1 d_2\{1 + g(x_{13}) - x_{13}\}], \\
\chi_2 &= a[c_1 e\{1 + g(x_{12}) - x_{12}\} + d_1 f\{1 + g(x_{13}) - x_{13}\}], \\
\chi_3 &= b_2(1+k^2)[c_1^2\{1 + g(x_{12}) - x_{12}\} - k^2[c_2^2\{1 + g(x_{12}) \\
&- x_{12}\} + d_2^2\{1 + g(x_{13}) - x_{13}\}] + d_1^2\{1 + g(x_{13}) - x_{13}\}], \\
\chi_4 &= -ak^2[c_2 e\{1 + g(x_{12}) - x_{12}\} + d_2 f\{1 + g(x_{13}) - x_{13}\}], \\
\chi_5 &= k^2[c_1 c_2\{1 + g(x_{12}) - x_{12}\} + d_1 d_2\{1 + g(x_{13}) - x_{13}\}].
\end{aligned} \tag{3.13}$$

Thus the nonzero leptonic CP asymmetry parameter $\varepsilon_1^\mu = -\varepsilon_1^\tau$ depends on all ten parameters of m_D^{CES} as well as on x_{12} and x_{13}.

We had earlier identified Im m_D^{CES} as the common source of the origin of a nonzero θ_{13} and leptonic CP violation. A real m_D^{CES} implies vanishing values for b_2, c_2 and d_2 in which case $\varepsilon_1^\mu = -\varepsilon_1^\tau$ vanishes identically and, as explained in Ref. [14], so does θ_{13}. However, the reverse statement is not true. One could have a vanishing leptonic CP asymmetry simply by setting $b_{1,2}$ to zero in (3.12). But, so long as Im m_D^{CES} is nonzero, e.g. through nonvanishing values of c_2 and d_2, θ_{13} need not vanish. Indeed, the leptonic CP asymmetry depends rather sensitively on $b_{1,2}$. We shall elaborate on this later in our numerical discussion.

4 Boltzmann equations and baryon asymmetry in different mass regimes

The Boltzmann equations of concern to us govern the evolution of the number densities of the hierarchical heavy neutrinos N_i and the left chiral lepton doublets $\not{L}_\alpha$. We here follow the treatment given in Ref. [24]. The equations involve decay transitions between N_i and $\not{L}_\alpha\phi$ as well as $\not{L}_\alpha^C\phi^\dagger$ plus scattering transitions $Qu^C \leftrightarrow N_i\not{L}_\alpha, \not{L}_\alpha Q^C \leftrightarrow N_i u^C, \not{L}_\alpha u \leftrightarrow N_i Q, \not{L}_\alpha\phi \leftrightarrow N_i V_\mu, \phi^\dagger V_\mu \leftrightarrow N_i\not{L}_\alpha, \not{L}_\alpha V_\mu \leftrightarrow N_i\phi^\dagger$. Here Q represents the left-chiral quark doublet with $Q^T = (u_L \;\; d_L)$ and V_μ can stand for B or $W_{1,2,3}$. We had already introduced in Sec. 1 the variable $z = M_1/T$ and the parametric function $\eta_a(z)$. When in thermal equilibrium, the latter is denoted by $\eta^{eq}(z)_a$. Recall that the number density of a particle of species a and mass m_a with g_a internal degrees of freedom is given by [25]

$$n_a(T) = \frac{g_a\, m_a^2\, T\; e^{\mu_a(T)/T}}{2\pi^2}\; K_2\left(\frac{m_a}{T}\right), \tag{4.1}$$

K_2 being the modified Bessel function of second kind with order 2. The corresponding equilibrium density, as given by setting the chemical potential $\mu_a(T)$ equal to zero, is

$$n_a^{\rm eq}(T) = \frac{g_a\, m_a^2\, T}{2\pi^2}\; K_2\left(\frac{m_a}{T}\right). \tag{4.2}$$

We are now in a position to make use of the Boltzmann evolution equations given in Ref. [24] – generalized with flavor [26]. In making this generalization, one comes across a subtlety: the active flavor in the mass

regime (given by the value of M_1) under consideration may not be individually e, μ or τ but some combination thereof. So we use a general flavor index λ for the lepton asymmetry. Now we write

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{d\eta_{N_i}}{dz} &= \frac{z}{H(z=1)}\left[\left(1-\frac{\eta_{N_i}}{\eta^{\rm eq}_{N_i}}\right)\sum_{\beta=e,\mu,\tau}\left(\Gamma^{\beta Di}+\Gamma^{\beta Si}_{\rm Yukawa}+\Gamma^{\beta Si}_{\rm Gauge}\right)\right.\\
&\left.-\frac{1}{4}\sum_{\beta=e,\mu,\tau}\eta^{\beta}_{L}\varepsilon^{\beta}_{i}\left(\Gamma^{\beta Di}+\tilde{\Gamma}^{\beta Si}_{\rm Yukawa}+\tilde{\Gamma}^{\beta Si}_{\rm Gauge}\right)\right],\\
\frac{d\eta^{\lambda}_{L}}{dz} &= -\frac{z}{H(z=1)}\left[\sum_{i=1}^{3}\varepsilon^{\lambda}_{i}\left(1-\frac{\eta_{N_i}}{\eta^{\rm eq}_{N_i}}\right)\sum_{\beta=e,\mu,\tau}\left(\Gamma^{\beta Di}+\Gamma^{\beta Si}_{\rm Yukawa}+\Gamma^{\beta Si}_{\rm Gauge}\right)\right.\\
&\left.+\frac{1}{4}\eta^{\lambda}_{L}\left\{\sum_{i=1}^{3}\left(\Gamma^{\lambda Di}+\Gamma^{\lambda Wi}_{\rm Yukawa}+\Gamma^{\lambda Wi}_{\rm Gauge}\right)+\Gamma^{\lambda\Delta L=2}_{\rm Yukawa}\right\}\right].
\end{aligned}\tag{4.3}$$

In each RHS of (4.3), apart from the Hubble rate of expansion H at the decay temperature, we have various transition widths Γ originally introduced in Ref. [25] which are linear combinations (normalized to the photon density) of different CP conserving collision terms γ^{X}_{Y} for the transitions $X\to Y$ and $\bar{X}\to\bar{Y}$. Here γ^{X}_{Y} is defined as

$$\gamma^{X}_{Y} \equiv \gamma(X\to Y)+\gamma(\overline{X}\to\overline{Y})\,,\tag{4.4}$$

with

$$\gamma(X\to Y) = \int d\pi_X\, d\pi_Y\,(2\pi)^4\,\delta^{(4)}(p_X-p_Y)\;e^{-p^0_X/T}\,|\mathcal{M}(X\to Y)|^2\,.\tag{4.5}$$

In (4.5) one has used a short hand notation for the phase space

$$d\pi_x = \frac{1}{S_x}\prod_{i=1}^{n_x}\frac{d^4p_i}{(2\pi)^3}\delta(p_i^2-m_i^2)\theta(p_i^0)\tag{4.6}$$

with $S_X = n_{id}!$ being a symmetry factor in case the initial state X contains a number n_{id} of identical particles. Moreover, the squared matrix element in (4.5) is summed (not averaged) over the internal degrees of freedom of the initial and final states.

The transition widths Γ in (4.3) are given as follows:

$$\Gamma^{\lambda Di} = \frac{1}{n_\gamma}\,\gamma^{N_i}_{\not{L}_\lambda\phi^\dagger}\,,\tag{4.7}$$

$$\Gamma^{\lambda Si}_{\rm Yukawa} = \frac{1}{n_\gamma}\left(\gamma^{N_i\not{L}_\lambda}_{Qu^C}+\gamma^{N_iu^C}_{\not{L}_\lambda Q^C}+\gamma^{N_iQ}_{\not{L}_\lambda u}\right),\tag{4.8}$$

$$\widetilde{\Gamma}^{\lambda Si}_{\rm Yukawa} = \frac{1}{n_\gamma}\left(\frac{\eta_{N_i}}{\eta^{\rm eq}_{N_i}}\gamma^{N_i\not{L}_\lambda}_{Qu^C}+\gamma^{N_iu^C}_{\not{L}_\lambda Q^C}+\gamma^{N_iQ}_{\not{L}_\lambda u}\right),\tag{4.9}$$

$$\Gamma^{\lambda Si}_{\rm Gauge} = \frac{1}{n_\gamma}\left(\gamma^{N_iV_\mu}_{\not{L}_\lambda\ \ \phi}+\gamma^{N_i\not{L}_\lambda}_{\phi^\dagger V_\mu}+\gamma^{N_i\phi^\dagger}_{\not{L}_\lambda V_\mu}\right),\tag{4.10}$$

$$\widetilde{\Gamma}^{\lambda Si}_{\rm Gauge} = \frac{1}{n_\gamma}\left(\gamma^{N_iV_\mu}_{\not{L}_\lambda\phi}+\frac{\eta_{N_i}}{\eta^{\rm eq}_{N_i}}\gamma^{N_i\not{L}_\lambda}_{\phi^\dagger V_\mu}+\gamma^{N_i\phi^\dagger}_{\not{L}_\lambda V_\mu}\right),\tag{4.11}$$

$$\Gamma^{\lambda Wi}_{\rm Yukawa} = \frac{2}{n_\gamma}\left(\gamma^{N_i\not{L}_\lambda}_{Qu^C}+\gamma^{N_iu^C}_{\not{L}_\lambda Q^C}+\gamma^{N_iQ}_{\not{L}_\lambda u}+\frac{\eta_{N_i}}{2\eta^{\rm eq}_{N_i}}\gamma^{N_i\not{L}_\lambda}_{Qu^C}\right),\tag{4.12}$$

$$\Gamma^{\lambda Wi}_{\rm Gauge} = \frac{2}{n_\gamma}\left(\gamma^{N_iV_\mu}_{\not{L}_\lambda\phi}+\gamma^{N_i\not{L}_\lambda}_{\phi^\dagger V_\mu}+\gamma^{N_i\phi^\dagger}_{\not{L}_\lambda V_\mu}+\frac{\eta_{N_i}}{2\eta^{\rm eq}_{N_i}}\gamma^{N_i\not{L}_\lambda}_{\phi^\dagger V_\mu}\right),\tag{4.13}$$

$$\Gamma^{\lambda\Delta L=2}_{\rm Yukawa} = \frac{2}{n_\gamma}\sum_{\beta=e,\mu\tau}\left(\gamma'^{\not{L}_\lambda\phi}_{L^C_\beta\phi^\dagger}+2\gamma^{\not{L}_\lambda\not{L}_\beta}_{\phi^\dagger\phi^\dagger}\right).\tag{4.14}$$

The explicit expressions for γ and γ' are given in Appendix B of [24]. The subscripts D, S and W stand for decay, scattering and washout respectively. We rewrite the Boltzmann equations in terms of $Y_{N_i}(z)=\eta_{N_i}(z)s^{-1}$ and certain D-functions of z that are defined below.

Consider the first equation in (4.3) to start with. Its second RHS term has been neglected for our assumed hierarchical leptogenesis since both η^{β}_{L} and ε^{β}_{i} are each quite small and their product much smaller[3]. Using some shorthand notation, as explained in Eqs. (4.16) - (4.18) below, we can now write

$$\frac{dY_{N_i(z)}}{dz} = \{D_i(z)+D^{\rm SY}_i(z)+D^{\rm SG}_i(z)\}\{(Y^{\rm eq}_{N_i}(z)-Y_{N_i}(z)\},\tag{4.15}$$

[3]In order of magnitude this product is $10^{-6}\times10^{-5}\sim10^{-11}$, as compared with the first term which is $\mathcal{O}(1)$.

where

$$D_i(z) = \sum_{\beta=e,\mu,\tau} D_i^{\beta}(z) = \sum_{\beta=e,\mu,\tau} \frac{z}{H(z=1)} \frac{\Gamma^{\beta Di}}{\eta_{N_i}^{\rm eq}(z)}, \tag{4.16}$$

$$D_i^{\rm SY}(z) = \sum_{\beta=e,\mu,\tau} \frac{z}{H(z=1)} \frac{\Gamma^{\beta Si}_{\rm Yukawa}}{\eta_{N_i}^{\rm eq}(z)}, \tag{4.17}$$

$$D_i^{\rm SG}(z) = \sum_{\beta=e,\mu,\tau} \frac{z}{H(z=1)} \frac{\Gamma^{\beta Si}_{\rm Gauge}}{\eta_{N_i}^{\rm eq}(z)}. \tag{4.18}$$

Turning to the second equation in (4.3) and neglecting the $\Delta L = 2$ scattering terms, we rewrite it as

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\eta_L^{\lambda}(z)}{dz} = & - \sum_{i=1}^{3} \varepsilon_i^{\lambda} \{D_i(z) + D_i^{\rm SY}(z) + D_i^{\rm SG}(z))(\eta_{N_i}^{\rm eq}(z) - \eta_{N_i}(z)\} \\ & - \frac{1}{4}\eta_L^{\lambda} \sum_{i=1}^{3} \{\frac{1}{2} D_i^{\lambda}(z) z^2 K_2(z) + D_i^{\lambda \rm YW}(z) + D_i^{\lambda \rm GW}(z))\} \end{aligned} \tag{4.19}$$

with

$$D_i^{\rm YW}(z) = \sum_{\beta=e,\mu,\tau} \frac{z}{H(z=1)} \Gamma^{\beta Wi}_{\rm Yukawa}, \tag{4.20}$$

$$D_i^{\rm GW}(z) = \sum_{\beta=e,\mu,\tau} \frac{z}{H(z=1)} \Gamma^{\beta Wi}_{\rm Gauge}. \tag{4.21}$$

A major simplification (4.19) occurs in our model when the active flavor λ equals e since $\varepsilon_1^e = 0$ and only the second RHS term contributes to the evolution of η^{λ}. Then the solution of the equation becomes [27]

$$\eta_L^e(z) = \eta_L^e(z=0) \exp[-\frac{1}{4} \int_0^z W^e(z') dz'], \tag{4.22}$$

where

$$W^e(z) = \frac{1}{2} D_1^e(z) z^2 K_2(z) + D_1^{e\rm YW}(z) + D_1^{e\rm GW}(z). \tag{4.23}$$

However, at a very high temperature, the lepton asymmetries get efficiently washed out. Therefore $\eta_L^e(z \to 0)$ vanishes and from (4.22) $\eta_L^e(z) = 0$ for all z. Similarly for unflavored (i.e flavor-summed) leptogenesis in our model $\eta^e + \eta^{\mu} + \eta^{\tau} = 0$ since $\varepsilon_1^{\mu} = -\varepsilon_1^{\tau}$.

We are now ready to calculate the baryon asymmetry from the lepton asymmetry. It is first convenient to define the variable

$$Y_{\lambda} = \frac{n_L^{\lambda} - n_{\bar{L}}^{\lambda}}{s} = \frac{n_{\gamma}}{s} \eta_L^{\lambda}, \tag{4.24}$$

i.e. the leptonic minus the antileptonic number density of the active flavor λ normalized to the entropy density. The factor s/η_{γ} is known to equal $1.8 g_{*s}$ and is a function of temperature. For $T > 10^2$ GeV, g_{*s} is known to remain nearly constant with temperature at a value (with three right chiral neutrinos) of about 112 [28]. Sphaleronic processes convert the lepton asymmetry created by the decay of the right chiral heavy neutrinos into a baryon asymmetry by keeping $\Delta_{\lambda} = \frac{1}{3} B - L^{\lambda}$ conserved. The $Y_{\Delta_{\lambda}}$, defined as $s^{-1}\{1/3(n_B - n_{\bar{B}}) - (n_L - n_{\bar{L}})\}$, and Y_{λ} asymmetries are linearly related, as under

$$Y_{\lambda} = \sum_{\rho} A_{\lambda\rho} Y_{\Delta_{\rho}}, \tag{4.25}$$

where $A_{\lambda\rho}$ are a set of numbers whose values depend on which of the three mass regimes in which M_1 lies, as mentioned in the Introduction. These are discussed in detail later in the section. Meanwhile, we can rewrite (4.19) as

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dY_{\Delta_{\lambda}}}{dz} = & \sum_{i=1}^{3} [\varepsilon_i^{\lambda} \{D_i(z) + D_i^{\rm SY}(z) + D_i^{\rm SG}(z)\} \{Y_{N_i}^{\rm eq}(z) - Y_{N_i}(z)\}] \\ & + \frac{1}{4} \sum_{\rho} A_{\lambda\rho} Y_{\Delta_{\rho}} \sum_{i=1}^{3} \{\frac{1}{2} D_i^{\lambda}(z) z^2 K_2(z) + D_i^{\lambda\ \rm YW}(z) + D_i^{\lambda\ \rm GW}(z)\}. \end{aligned} \tag{4.26}$$

We need to solve (4.15) and (4.26) and evolve Y_{N_i} as well as $Y_{\Delta_{\lambda}}$ upto a value of z where the quantities $Y_{\Delta_{\lambda}}$ become constant with z, i.e. do not change as z is varied. The final baryon asymmetry Y_B is obtained [29] linearly in terms $Y_{\Delta_{\lambda}}$, the coefficient depending on the mass regime in which M_1 is located, as explained in what follows. Let us then discuss three mass regimes separately.

4.1 $\mathbf{M_1 < 10^9}$ GeV

Here all three lepton flavors are separately distinguishable. Therefore the flavor index λ can just be $\lambda = e$ or μ or τ. In this case the 3×3 A matrix, whose λ, ρ element relates Y_λ and Y_{Δ_ρ}, is given by [7]

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} -151/179 & 20/179 & 20/179 \\ 25/358 & -344/537 & 14/537 \\ 25/358 & 14/537 & -344/537 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{4.27}$$

Now the final baryon asymmetry normalized to the entropy density, is given by [30]

$$Y_B = \frac{28}{79}(Y_{\Delta_\mu} + Y_{\Delta_\tau}) \tag{4.28}$$

since Y_{Δ_e} vanishes on account of η_L^e being zero. Another important parameter, namely the baryon asymmetry normalized to the photon density, obtains as

$$\eta_B = \frac{s}{n_\gamma}\bigg|_0 Y_B = 7.0394 Y_B, \tag{4.29}$$

the subscript zero denoting the present epoch.

4.2 $\mathbf{10^9}$ GeV $< \mathbf{M_1 < 10^{12}}$ GeV

In this regime the τ flavor is distinguishable but one cannot differentiate between the e and μ flavors. It is therefore convenient to define two sets of CP asymmetry parameters ε^τ and $\varepsilon^2 = \varepsilon^e + \varepsilon^\mu$. Therefor the index λ takes the values τ and 2. The Boltzmann equations lead to the two asymmetries Y_{Δ_τ} and Y_{Δ_2}. These are related to Y_τ and Y_2 by a 2×2 A-matrix given by [7]

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} -417/589 & 120/589 \\ 30/589 & -390/589 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{4.30}$$

The final baryon asymmetry Y_B is then calculated as [7]

$$Y_B = \frac{28}{79}(Y_{\Delta_2} + Y_{\Delta_\tau}). \tag{4.31}$$

4.3 $\mathbf{M_1 > 10^{12}}$ GeV

In this case all the lepton flavors act indistinguishably leading to a single CP asymmetry parameter $\varepsilon_i = \sum_\lambda \varepsilon_i^\lambda$. As mentioned earlier, $\sum_\lambda \eta_L^\lambda = 0$ and $Y_\Delta = 0$. Therefore $Y_B = 0$ and no baryogenesis is possible in this mass regime. This statement is independent of the mass ordering of the light neutrinos.

5 Numerical analysis: methodology and discussion

In order to check the viability of our theoretical results numerically, the allowed (3σ) values of globally fitted neutrino oscillation data [31] and the upper bound of 0.23 eV on the sum of the light neutrino masses have been used, cf. Table 3. We first constrain the parameter space constructed with the six rescaled parameters defined in Eqs. (2.17) - (2.20). Both normal and inverted types of light neutrino mass ordering are found to be allowed over a sizable region of the parameter space consistent with the input constraints. The ranges of

Table 3: Input values used

Parameters	θ_{12} degrees	θ_{23} degrees	θ_{13} degrees	Δm^2_{21} 10^{-5}eV^2	$\lvert\Delta m^2_{31}\rvert$ $10^{-3}(\text{eV}^2)$	$\Sigma_i m_i$ (eV)
3σ ranges/ others	$31.29 - 35.91$	$38.3 - 53.3$	$7.87 - 9.11$	$7.02 - 8.09$	$2.32 - 2.59$	< 0.23
Best fit values (NO)	33.48	42.3	8.50	7.50	2.46	–
Best fit values (IO)	33.48	49.5	8.51	7.50	2.45	–

the rescaled parameters are graphically shown in Fig.2 and Fig.3 respectively for the normal and the inverted ordering of the light neutrino masses. This is the primary constraining procedure since the CP asymmetry parameters ε_i^α and the different Γ's of the Boltzmann equations depend individually upon the elements of m_D and the RH neutrino masses M_i ($i = 1, 2, 3$). Therefore, merely restricting the rescaled parameters is not sufficient for the computation of the final baryon asymmetry. In order to obtain the allowed ranges of



Figure 2: Plots of the reduced parameters for normal mass ordering



Figure 3: Plots of the reduced parameters for inverted mass ordering

the parameters a, $b_{1,2}$, $c_{1,2}$ and e, included in m_D, we incorporate the strong hierarchy assumption of the RH neutrino masses ($M_1 << M_2 << M_3$), as mentioned in earlier sections. For numerical purposes, we choose M_2 and M_3 to be $M_2 \sim 10^3 M_1$, $M_3 \sim 10^3 M_2$. Depending upon the mass regime, for a fixed value of M_1, we then obtain the allowed ranges of the parameters of m_D from the relations defined in Eqs. (2.17) - (2.20).

Even after constraining the six unprimed parameters of m_D and the masses of the three right handed heavy neutrinos, three undetermined parameters remain – namely f, d_1 and d_2. The latter has been neglected earlier in the primary implementation of the input constraints since their contributions to the light neutrino mass matrix M_ν are suppressed by the heaviest RH neutrino mass M_3. However, for a quantitatively successful treatment of leptogenesis, one needs to estimate these missing parameters too, as mentioned in Sec. 2. We discuss here some technical details regarding this estimation. For example, let us consider the first equation of Table 1, namely

$$x = -\left(\frac{a^2}{M_1} + \frac{e^2}{M_2} + \frac{f^2}{M_3}\right). \tag{5.1}$$

The last RHS term was earlier neglected on the ground of the parameter f, which is presumably of same the order of magnitude as a or e, being suppressed by M_3. Now in order to estimate f, we first set it at a value which is larger between a and e. Then we keep on decreasing it until the quantity $f^2 M_3^{-1}/(a^2 M_1^{-1} + e^2 M_2^{-1})$ becomes less than a very small number which we choose to be 10^{-5}. In a similar manner one can estimate approximate values of d_1 and d_2. Thus, knowing the numerical values of all the parameters of m_D as well as those of M_R, we can make a realistic estimate of the final value of baryon asymmetry. The first step towards the last-mentioned goal is the estimation of ε_1^α in the three mass regimes of M_1. We have carried out our numerical analysis over a wide range of values of M_1 in the τ-flavored and the fully flavored regimes. As mentioned in the last paragraph of Sec. 3, $\varepsilon_1^{\mu,\tau}$ are mostly sensitive to $b_{1,2}$. In order to see the nature of the variation of $\varepsilon_1^{\mu,\tau}$ with $b_{1,2}$ for constant values of c_2 and d_2, we first set c_2 and d_2 to be zero. Now the simplified expression of the relevant CP asymmetry parameter becomes

$$\varepsilon_1^\mu = \xi(b_2 k^2 \chi_2 + b_1 \chi_3') = -\varepsilon_1^\tau, \tag{5.2}$$

where ξ and χ_2 as are defined in (3.13), and χ_3' is given by

$$\chi_3' = b_2(1+k^2)[c_1^2\{1 + g(x_{12}) - x_{12}) + d_1^2(1 + g(x_{13}) - x_{13}\}]. \tag{5.3}$$

For a graphical representation of the variation of the CP asymmetry parameter ε_1^μ with $b_{1,2}$, we choose a sample value of $M_1 = 1.33 \times 10^8$ GeV and assume a normal mass ordering[4] of the light neutrinos. The corresponding scatter plots are shown in Fig. 4. The vanishing of $b_{1,2}$ implies $\varepsilon_1^\mu = 0$; therefore, in our



Figure 4: Plot of ε_1^μ with b_1 (left), b_2 (right) for normal mass ordering.

numerical computation, only those values of ε_1^μ are allowed which correspond to $b_{1,2} \neq 0$. One can have a similar plot for ε_1^τ since $\varepsilon_1^\mu = -\varepsilon_1^\tau$ and the plots in Fig. 4 are symmetric about the origin. Corresponding plots for an inverted mass ordering of the light neutrinos can also be generated. However, with the same computational technique as used for normal ordering, we find a much smaller number of allowed points which hardly show a fair variation of ε_1^μ with $b_{1,2}$.

[4] As we shall see later, in our model an inverted mass ordering is disfavored in terms of a realistic baryogenesis.

Finally, knowing the numerical range of ε_1^λ is the last step needed to solve the Boltzmann equations given in (4.15) and (4.26) leading to the parameter Y_{Δ_λ} upto a fairly large value of z where Y_{Δ_λ} becomes constant. Then, using the suitable equations (4.28),(4.31), depending upon the energy regime, one can compute the final value of Y_B. However, this final step needs to overcome the following hurdle. Unlike estimating ε_1^λ for the entire allowed parameter ranges of m_D and M_R, it becomes impractical in terms of computer time to solve the Boltzmann equations for this huge data set even if M_1 is fixed to a constant value. So we were obliged to use only those values of the members of parameter set for which the neutrino oscillation observables are restricted to their best fit values. For this purpose we choose a χ^2 for every observable deviating from its experimentally measured best fit value as

$$\chi^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{5} \Big[\frac{O_i(th) - O_i(bf)}{\Delta O_i}\Big]. \tag{5.4}$$

In (5.4) O_i denotes the ith neutrino oscillation observable from among $(\Delta m^2_{21}, \Delta m^2_{32}, \theta_{12}, \theta_{23}, \theta_{13})$ and the summation runs over all the five observables. The parenthetical th stands for the theoretical prediction, i.e the numerical value of the observable given by our model, whereas bf denotes the best fit value (cf. Table 3). ΔO_i in the denominator stands for the measured 1σ range of O_i. After calculating χ^2 for all the points $\{a', e', b'_1, c'_1, b'_2, c'_2\}$, as allowed by the oscillation data, we proceed to compute ε_1^λ only with that primed data set which corresponds to the minimum value of χ^2 denoted by χ^2_{min}. Still, the RH neutrino mass M_1 is free to be varied. So, for the particular primed data set, we are able to generate large number of unprimed points (parameters of m_D) by varying the values of M_1 in Eqs. (2.17)-(2.20). To be more precise, 'n' values of M_1 lead to 'n' number of values of the unprimed set of parameters for the particular primed set under consideration. The other three parameters f, d_1 and d_2 are again computed by means of the previously mentioned approximation technique. We vary M_1 over a wide range in the relevant mass regimes for both types of mass ordering and present our final result systematically in the following way. We reemphasize that these are only for the best-fit choice of the input parameters.

Y_B for normal ordering:

After carrying out the χ^2 analysis, the set of primed parameters corresponding to the minimum value of χ^2, cf. (5.4), is determined and listed in the Table 4. For this single set, M_1 is varied over a wide range. Then,

Table 4: parameters corresponding χ^2_{min} for normal mass ordering.

a'	e'	b'_1	c'_1	b'_2	c'_2	χ^2_{min}
-0.0164	-0.0492	-0.081	-0.092	-0.10	-0.0087	0.002

for each value of M_1, a set of values of the unprimed parameters $\{a, e, f, b_1, c_1, d_1, b_2, c_2, d_2\}$ is generated. The Boltzmann equations are solved for each set of values of M_1 and and of every member of the set in Table 4 plus the corresponding unprimed parameters depending upon the mass regime.

$\mathbf{M_1 < 10^9}$ GeV: Since, in this regime, all lepton flavors (e, μ, τ) act distinguishably, we need to solve the Boltzmann equations for each flavor to obtain a variation of Y_{Δ_λ} or Y_B with z. We take thirty values of M_1 within the range 10^6 GeV to 10^9 GeV and solve the Boltzmann equations thirty times for each M_1 along with the corresponding unprimed set of rescaled parameters. For a concise presentation, in Table 5, we tabulate only eleven such values of M_1 for which Y_B is near or inside the observed range. Fig.5 contains

Table 5: Y_B for different masses of lightest right handed neutrino

$\frac{M_1}{10^8}$ (GeV)	1.30	1.31	1.32	1.33	1.34	1.35	1.36	1.37	1.38	1.39	1.40
$Y_B \times 10^{11}$	8.50	8.56	8.63	8.69	8.76	8.82	8.89	8.95	9.02	9.08	9.15

a graphical presentation of the variation of the asymmetries Y_{Δ_μ}, Y_{Δ_τ} and Y_B with z for a definite value of M_1 which is 1.33×10^8 GeV. It may be seen that Y_B is inside the observed range [1] for large z at the present epoch. A careful surveillance of Table 5 leads to the conclusion that we can get upper and lower bounds on M_1 due to the constraint from the observed range of Y_B. One can appreciate this fact more clearly from the plot of Y_B with M_1 in Fig.6. Two straight lines have been drawn parallel to the abscissa in Fig.6: one at $Y_B = 8.55 \times 10^{-11}$ and the other at $Y_B = 8.77 \times 10^{-11}$. The values of M_1 where the straight lines meet the Y_B vs z curve yield the lower and upper bounds on M_1, namely $(M_1)_{lower} = 1.308 \times 10^8$ GeV, $(M_1)_{upper} = 1.342 \times 10^8$ GeV.



Figure 5: Variation of Y_{Δ_μ} (left), Y_{Δ_τ} (middle), Y_B (right) with z in the mass regime (1) for a definite value of M_1. N.B. Since these become negative for certain values of z, their negatives have been plotted on the log scale for those values of z. Normal mass ordering for the light neutrinos has been considered.



Figure 6: Plot of final Y_B for different values of M_1.

10^9 GeV $< \mathbf{M_1} < 10^{12}$ GeV: We have carried out the same analysis In this regime too, taking several values of M_1 in the range 10^9 GeV to 10^{12} GeV. However, Y_B attains a negative final value in each of the cases. Therefore, one can conclude that successful baryogenesis is not possible in the τ flavored regime.

$\mathbf{M_1} > 10^{12}$ GeV: It has been shown that $Y_B = 0$ here for our model.

Y_B for inverted ordering:

In this case too the numerical estimation of the baryon asymmetry parameter has been made exactly in the same manner as for a normal mass ordering. Values of the primed parameters that correspond to χ^2_{min} are presented in Table 6. We then turn to the different mass regimes.

Table 6: parameters corresponding to minimum value of χ^2 for inverted hierarchy

a'	e'	b'_1	c'_1	b'_2	c'_2	χ^2_{min}
-0.21	-0.050	-0.010	0.091	-0.050	0.118	0.246

$\mathbf{M_1} < 10^9$ GeV: Here the estimated value of Y_B is found to be below the observed lower bound of 8.55×10^{-11}. Numerically Y_B is found to attain the maximum value of 1.4×10^{-11} for the heaviest neutrino mass

$M_1 \sim 9.9 \times 10^8$ GeV. Thus, though a positive Y_B can be generated in this case, the amount is not adequate to fall within its observed range.

10^9 GeV $< \mathbf{M_1} < 10^{12}$ GeV: In this regime we numerically find Y_B to be negative and hence it is discarded.

$\mathbf{M_1} > 10^{12}$ GeV: Once again, $Y_B = 0$ here for the present model.

A compact presentation of the final numerical results regarding Y_B is given in Table 7.

Table 7: Final statement on Y_B for the best fit parameters of m_D.

Y_B	$M_1 < 10^9$ GeV	10^9 GeV $< M_1 < 10^{12}$ GeV	$M_1 > 10^{12}$ GeV
Normal Ordering	whithin observed range	negative	null
Inverted Ordering	below observed range	negative	null

Before concluding this numerical discussion we would like to emphasize one point. Though we had earlier mentioned the numerical difficulties in solving the Boltzmann equations for each data point within the entire 3σ parameter ranges of m_D, we are able to perform the job only for a few data points in that range. However we see that there is no specific variation of Y_B with the chosen data points. For example, given a normal ordering of the light neutrino masses, we take the data set that corresponds to the worst fit point (χ^2_{max}) and solve the Boltzmann equations for $M_1 < 10^9$ GeV; this gives us a negative final value of Y_B contrary to the result obtained in the best fit (χ^2_{min}) case. For the other data points also, the variation of Y_B with the parameters of m_D is random and varies widely from one neutrino mass model to another [32–35]. This conclusion is true for all mass regimes (except for $M_1 > 10^{12}$ GeV where $\sum_\lambda \varepsilon_1^\lambda = 0$ and hence Y_B vanishes) as well as for an inverted ordering. Table 7 shows that an inverted mass ordering is not favored in this model. However, *we cannot completely rule out this mass ordering here since Y_B randomly fluctuates with the model parameters.* There may exist certain data sets in the allowed 3σ ranges for which the proper value of Y_B can be generated even with an inverted light neutrino mass ordering. A similar statement needs to be made about baryogenesis in the $\tau-$flavored regime (10^9 GeV $< M_1 < 10^{12}$ GeV). While it is disfavored in our model, it cannot be totally ruled out.

6 Summary and discussion

Some of us has recently proposed [14] a complex-extended scaling model of light neutrino Majorana mass matrix M_ν, generated by a type-1 seesaw induced by heavy RH neutrinos. Unlike the Simple Real Scaling model advanced earlier [19, 20], this new model can accommodate a nonzero θ_{13} and has a sizable region of parameter space allowed by all current and relevant experimental data [31]. The atmospheric mixing angle θ_{23} is given by $\tan^{-1}(1/k)$, k being real positive scaling factor which can be either greater or less than unity. Most interesting are the prediction of the model in regard to CP violation: maximal ($\cos\delta = 0$) for the Dirac type and absent (α, β=0 or π) for the Majorana type. Since CP violation is crucially related to baryogenesis, we have been motivated in this paper to investigate the latter quantitatively in the model under consideration.

We first performed a general calculation of the CP asymmetry parameters ε_i^α in the decays $N_i \to \not{L}_\alpha \phi, \not{L}^C_\alpha \phi^\dagger$ in terms of the parameters of the model. This led to a vanishing value of ε_i^e with a generally nonvanishing $\varepsilon_i^\mu = -\varepsilon_i^\tau$. A common source of the origin of nonzero θ_{13} and these CP asymmetries was found in the imaginary part of m_D. We then evolved Y_μ and Y_τ , respectively equal to $(n_L^\mu - n_{\bar{L}}^\mu)/s$ and $(n_L^\tau - n_{\bar{L}}^\tau)/s$, from a high temperature down to that of the electroweak phase transition. In doing so we have had to consider the Boltzmann equations for Y_{N_i} and Y_λ, respectively equal to n_{N_i}/s and $(n_L^\lambda - n_{\bar{L}}^\lambda)/s$. Here λ stands for an active lepton flavor index which can sometimes be a combination of e, μ, τ. We then utilized the different linear relations between Y_λ and Y_{Δ_λ}, with $\Delta_\lambda = \frac{1}{3}B - L_\lambda$, for the three different specified mass regimes to arrive at the baryon asymmetry of the universe for each regime. The latter values have been evaluated numerically and their implications discussed.

In a nutshell, realistic baryogenesis has been found to be possible in this model for the best fit values of the input neutrino oscillation observables only in the $M_1 < 10^9$ GeV regime and for a normal mass ordering of the light neutrinos. This analysis disfavors (from a baryogenesis standpoint) the regimes 10^9 GeV $< M_1 < 10^{12}$ GeV and $M_1 > 10^{12}$ GeV as well as an inverted mass ordering of the light neutrinos. However, this possibilities cannot be excluded owing to the highly sensitive dependence of Y_B on the input parameters away from their best-fit values. As neutrino oscillation data improve, the conclusions from our analysis will

be sharpened.

Acknowledgement

The work of RS and AG is supported by the Department of Atomic Energy (DAE), Government of India. MC acknowledges support from Saha Institute of Nuclear Physics where a part of this work was done. The work of PR has been supported by Indian National Science Academy.

References

[1] P.A.R Ade et al. [Planck Collaboration], arXiv: 1502.01589 [astro-ph. CO].

[2] J.M Cline, arXiv: 0609145 [hep-ph].

[3] M. Fukugita and T. Yanagida, Phys. Lett. **B174** (1986) 45.

[4] A. Riotto and M. Trodden, Ann. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci. **49** (1999) 35.

[5] S. Davidson, E Nardi and Y. Nir, Phys. Rept. **466** (2008) 105.

[6] E. Bertuzzo, P.D Bari, F Feruglio and E. Nardi, JHEP **0911** (2009) 036.

[7] A. Abada, S. Davidson, A. Ibarra, F.-X Josse-Michaux, M. Losada and A. Riotto, JHEP **0609** (2006) 010.

[8] S. Antusch, S.F King and A. Riotto, JCAP **0611** (2006) 011.

[9] P. Minkowski, Phys. Lett. **67b** (1977) 421.

[10] M. Gell-Mann, P.Ramond and R. Slansky, Conf. Proc. **C790927** (1979) 315.

[11] T. Yanagida, Prog. Theor. Phys. **64** (1980) 1103.

[12] R.N. Mohapatra, Phys. Rev. Lett. **56** (1986) 561.

[13] A.D Sakharov, JETP Lett. **5** (1967) 24.

[14] R. Samanta, P. Roy and Ambar Ghosal, arXiv: 1604.06731 [hep-ph].

[15] R. Samanta, P. Roy and A. Ghosal, arXiv:1604.01206 [hep-ph].

[16] P. Chen, G. J. Ding and S. F. King, JHEP **1603**, 206 (2016).

[17] K.A Olive et al [Particle Data Group] Chinese Physics C38, 090001 (2014).

[18] C.S Lam, Phys. Lett B **656**, 193 (2007); Phys. Rev. Lett. **101**, 121602 (2008); Phys. Rev. D **78**, 073015 (2008).

[19] L. Lavoura, Phys. Rev. D **62**, 093011 (2000).

[20] R.N Mohapatra and W. Rodejohann, Phys. Lett. B **644**, 59 (2007).

[21] B. Adhikary, M. Chakraborty and A. Ghosal, Phys. Rev. D **86**, 013015 (2012).

[22] A. Ghosal and R. Samanta, JHEP **1505**, 077 (2015).

[23] A.S Joshipura and W. Rodejohann, Phys. Lett. B **678**, 276(2009).

[24] A. Pilaftsis and T.E.J. Underwood, Nucl. Phys. **B692** (2004) 392.

[25] J. Edsjo and P. Gondolo, Phys. Rev. **D56** (1997) 1879.

[26] B. Adhikary, M. Chakraborty and A. Ghosal, Phys. Rev. D **93**, no. 11, 113001 (2016)

[27] W. Buchmuller, P. Di Bari and M. Plumacher, Annals Phys. **315**, 305 (2005).

[28] E. W Kolb and M.S Turner, Front. Phys. **69** (1990)1.

[29] B. Adhikary, phys. Rev. **D74** (2006) 033002.

[30] J.A. Harvey and M.S. Turner, Phys. Rev. **D42** (1990)3344.

[31] M. C. Gonzalez-Garcia, M. Maltoni and T. Schwetz, Nucl. Phys. B **908**, 199 (2016)

[32] C. Hagedorn, E. Molinaro and S. T. Petcov, JHEP **0909**, 115 (2009).

[33] S. Blanchet, D. Marfatia and A. Mustafayev, JHEP **1011**, 038 (2010).

[34] M. Borah, D. Borah and M. K. Das, Phys. Rev. D **91**, 113008 (2015).

[35] J. Gehrlein, S. T. Petcov, M. Spinrath and X. Zhang, Nucl. Phys. B **899**, 617 (2015).